2019 Accountability Administrator's Guide

for Texas Public School Districts and Campuses

TEA
Texas Education Agency

Office of Governance and Accountability
Performance Reporting Division

Table of Contents

2019 Accountability Administrator's Guide

About this Guide

The *2019 Accountability Administrator's Guide* briefly explains how the Texas Education Agency (TEA) uses the accountability system to evaluate the academic performance of Texas public schools. The guide describes the accountability system and explains how information from various sources is used to calculate and assign accountability ratings and award distinction designations.

This guide is intended to provide information that is relevant to school district and open-enrollment charter school administrators. The *2019 Accountability Manual* provides additional technical details and scenarios beyond those provided in this guide.

Part 1—Who is Rated?

Districts and campuses with students enrolled in the fall of the 2018–19 school year as reported for the TSDS PEIMS October snapshot are assigned a state accountability rating.

Districts

Beginning the first year they report fall enrollment, school districts and open-enrollment charter schools are rated based on the aggregate results of students in their campuses. Districts without any students enrolled in the grades for which STAAR assessments are administered (3–12) are assigned the rating label of *Not Rated.*

Campuses

Beginning the first year they report fall enrollment, campuses and open-enrollment charter schools, including alternative education campuses (AECs), are rated based on the performance of their students. For the purposes of assigning accountability ratings, campuses that do not serve any grade level for which the STAAR assessments are administered are paired with campuses in their district that serve students who take STAAR.

Rating Labels

Districts and campuses receive an overall rating, as well as a rating for each domain. The 2019 rating labels are as follows.

Districts and Campuses

- *A, B, C,* or *D*: Assigned for overall performance and for performance in each domain to districts and campuses (including those evaluated under alternative education accountability [AEA]) that meet the performance target for the letter grade

- *F*: Assigned for overall performance and for performance in each domain to districts and campuses (including AEAs) that do not meet the performance target to earn at least a *D*

- *Not Rated*: Assigned to districts and campuses that—under certain, specific circumstances—do not receive a rating

Single-Campus Districts

A school district or charter school comprised of only one campus that shares the same 2019 performance data with its only campus must meet the performance targets required for the campus in order to demonstrate acceptable performance. For these single-campus school districts and charter schools, the 2019 performance targets applied to the campus are also applied to the district, ensuring that both the district and campus receive identical ratings.

In a few specific circumstances, a district or campus does not receive a rating. When this occurs, a district or campus is given one of the following labels.

Not Rated indicates that a district or campus does not receive a rating for one or more of the following reasons:

- The district or campus has no data in the accountability subset.
- The district or campus has insufficient data to assign a rating.
- The district operates only residential facilities.
- The campus is a Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP).
- The campus is a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP).
- The campus is a residential facility.

- The commissioner otherwise determines that the district or campus will not be rated.

Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues indicates data accuracy or integrity have compromised performance results, making it impossible to assign a rating. The assignment of a *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues* label may be permanent or temporary pending investigation.

Not Rated: Annexation indicates that the campus is in its first school year after annexation by another district and, therefore, is not rated, as allowed by the annexation agreement with the agency.

Part 2—Data Sources

2019 STAAR-Based Indicators

Accountability Subset Rule

A subset of assessment results is used to calculate each domain. The calculation includes only assessment results for students enrolled in the district or campus in a previous fall, as reported on the TSDS PEIMS October snapshot. Three assessment administration periods are considered for accountability purposes:

STAAR results are included in the subset of district/campus accountability	if the student was enrolled in the district/campus on this date:
EOC summer 2018 administration	Fall 2017 enrollment snapshot
EOC fall 2018 administration	Fall 2018 enrollment snapshot
EOC spring 2019 administration	
Grades 3–8 spring 2019 administration	

The 2019 accountability subset rules apply to the STAAR performance results evaluated across all three domains.

- Grades 3–8: districts and campuses are responsible for students reported as enrolled in the fall (referred to as October snapshot) in the spring assessment results.

- End-of-Course (EOC): districts and campuses are responsible for
  - summer 2018 results for students reported as enrolled in fall 2017 snapshot;
  - fall 2018 results for students reported as enrolled in the fall 2018 snapshot; and
  - spring 2019 results for students reported as enrolled in the fall 2018 snapshot.

STAAR Retest Performance

The opportunity to retest is available to students who have taken grades 5 and 8 STAAR reading, mathematics, or EOC assessments in any subject.

- Student Success Initiative (SSI) – For students in grades 5 and 8, performance calculations will include assessment results for reading and mathematics from either the first administration or the first retest administration of all STAAR versions. The second retest administration in June 2019 is not used.

- For students in grades 5 and 8, the STAAR reading and mathematics assessment results from the first and second administration (first retest opportunity) are processed in two steps. First, the best result from both administrations is found for each subject. The best result is found for performance and progress, considered separately. If all results have the same level of performance, then the most recent result is selected for calculation. Second, the accountability subset rules determine whether the result is included in accountability.

- EOC retesters are counted as passers based on the passing standard in place when they were first eligible to take any EOC assessment.

- A district may retest a student who achieves the Approaches Grade Level standard on an English I EOC assessment or an Algebra I EOC assessment in order to provide an opportunity for the student to achieve the Meets Grade Level or Masters Grade Level standard only under the following conditions:

- o the student is in ninth grade;
- o the student first takes the EOC during the December administration; and
- o the student retakes the EOC during the spring administration immediately following the December administration during which the student first took the assessment.

In this case, the best result from both administrations is found for each subject retested. Second, the accountability subset rules determine whether the result is included in accountability. If all results have the same level of performance, then the most recent result is selected for calculation. The following charts provide examples of how the accountability subset is applied to EOC retesters.

Accountability Subset Examples for EOC Retesters

Enrolled	*Tested*	*Enrolled*	*Tested*	*Tested*
October 2017 Snapshot **Campus A**	Summer 2018 **Campus A**	October 2018 Snapshot **Campus A**	Fall 2018 **Campus A**	Spring 2019 **Campus A**
The best result is selected. Each result meets the accountability subset rule.				

For students who enrolled and tested at a different district or campus during the 2018–19 school year, the student's single best result for each EOC is selected. The best result is found for performance and progress, considered separately. If all results have the same level of performance, the most recent result is selected for calculations. The selected result is applied to the district and campus that administered the assessment if the student meets the accountability subset rule (discussed above).

Enrolled	*Tested*	*Enrolled*	*Tested*	*Tested*
October 2017 Snapshot **Campus A**	Summer 2018 **Campus A**	October 2018 Snapshot **Campus A**	Fall 2018 **Campus B**	Spring 2019 **Campus B**
The best result is selected. Only the summer 2018 result meets the accountability subset rule.				

2019 TSDS PEIMS-Based Indicators

One of the primary sources for data used in the accountability system is the TSDS PEIMS data collection. The TSDS PEIMS data collection has a prescribed process and timeline that offer school districts the opportunity to correct data submission errors or data omissions discovered following the initial data submission. TSDS PEIMS data provided by school districts and used to create specific indicators are listed below.

TSDS PEIMS data used for accountability indicators	Data for
4-year Longitudinal Graduation Rate	Class of 2018
5-year Longitudinal Graduation Rate	Class of 2017
6-year Longitudinal Graduation Rate	Class of 2016

TSDS PEIMS data used for accountability indicators	Data for
Annual Dropout Rate	2017–18 School Year
Enlist in U.S. Armed Forces	
Earn an Industry-Based Certification	
Earn an Associate's Degree	
Graduate with Completed IEP and Workforce Readiness	
Graduate Under an Advanced Degree Plan and be Identified as a Current Special Education Student	
CTE Coherent Sequence Coursework Aligned with Industry-Based Certifications	2017–18, 2016–17, 2015–16, and 2014–15 School Years
Complete College Prep Course	
Dual-Credit Course Completion	

2019 Other Indicators

The College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR) component of the accountability system includes data from ACT, Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), SAT, Texas Success Initiative (TSI) assessment results, OnRamps, and Level I and Level II certificates.

Other data used for College, Career, and Military Readiness	Data reported for
ACT college admissions test	Tests as of July 2018 administration (2017–18, 2016–17, 2015–16, and 2014–15 school years)
AP examination	Tests as of May 2018 administration (2017–18, 2016–17, 2015–16, and 2014–15 school years)
IB examination	Tests as of May 2018 administration (2017–18, 2016–17, 2015–16, and 2014–15 school years)
TSI assessment	Tests from June 2011 to October 2018 administration
SAT college admissions test	Tests as of June 2018 administration (2017–18, 2016–17, 2015–16, and 2014–15 school years)
OnRamps dual-enrollment course completion	Courses completed during the 2017–18, 2016–17, 2015–16, and 2014–15 school years
Level I and Level II certificates	Certificates earned during the 2017–18, 2016–17, 2015–16, and 2014–15 school years

Ensuring Data Integrity

Accurate data is fundamental to accountability ratings. The system depends on the responsible collection and submission of assessment and TSDS PEIMS information by school districts and charter schools. Responsibility for the accuracy and quality of data used to determine district and campus ratings, therefore, rests with local authorities. An appeal that is solely based on a district's submission of inaccurate data will likely be denied.

Because accurate and reliable data are the foundation of the accountability system, TEA has established several steps to protect the quality and integrity of the data and the accountability ratings that are based on that data.

- **Campus Number Tracking:** Requests for campus number changes may be approved with consideration of prior state accountability ratings. An *F* or *Improvement Required* rating for the same campus assigned two different campus numbers may be considered as consecutive years of unacceptable ratings for accountability interventions and sanctions, if the commissioner determines this is necessary to preserve the integrity of the accountability system.

- **Data Validation System:** Data Validation is a data-driven system designed to confirm the integrity of district submitted data. Annual data validation analyses examine districts' leaver and dropout data, student assessment data, discipline data and may also validate other district submitted data. Districts identified with potential data integrity concerns engage in a process to either validate the accuracy of their data or determine that erroneous data were submitted. This process is fundamental to the integrity of all the agency's evaluation systems. For more information, see the Data Validation Manuals on the PBM website at http://tea.texas.gov/pbm/DVManuals.aspx.

- **Test Security:** As part of ongoing efforts to improve security measures surrounding the assessment program, TEA uses a comprehensive set of test security procedures designed to assure parents, students, and the public that assessment results are meaningful and valid. Among other measures, districts are required to implement seating charts during all administrations, conduct annual training for all testing personnel, and maintain certain test administration materials for five years. Detailed information about test security policies for the state assessment program is available online at https://txassessmentdocs.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/ODCCM/pages/191694176/Security.

- *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues:* This rating is used when the accuracy and/or integrity of performance results have been compromised, preventing the assignment of a rating. This label may be assigned temporarily pending an on-site investigation or may be the final rating for the year. It is not equivalent to an *F* rating, though the commissioner of education has the authority to lower a rating or assign an *F* rating due to data quality issues. A *Not Rated* rating does not break the chain of consecutive years of unacceptable accountability ratings for accountability sanctions and interventions purposes. All districts and campuses with a final rating label of *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues* are automatically subject to desk audits the following year.

These steps can occur either before or after the ratings release, and sanctions can be imposed at any time. To the extent possible, ratings for the year are finalized when updated ratings are released following the resolution of appeals. A rating change resulting from an imposed sanction will stand as the final rating for the year.

Part 3—Overview of the 2019 Accountability System

The overall design of the accountability system evaluates performance according to three domains. For additional information on each domain, see Chapters 2, 3, and 4 of the *2019 Accountability Manual*.

Student Achievement Domain

Student Achievement evaluates performance across all subjects for all students, on both general and alternate assessments, College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR) indicators, and graduation rates.

STAAR Component—Methodology

One point is given for each percentage of assessment results across all subjects that are at or above the following:

- Approaches Grade Level or above

- Meets Grade Level or above

- Masters Grade Level

The STAAR component score is calculated by dividing the total points (cumulative performance for the three performance levels) by three resulting in an overall score of 0 to 100 for all districts and campuses.

College, Career, and Military Readiness Component—Methodology

The CCMR component of the Student Achievement domain measures graduates' preparedness for college, the workforce, or the military. One point is given for each annual graduate who accomplishes any one of the CCMR indicators, except for CTE coherent sequence graduates who earn one-half point credit for coursework completion and credit aligned with industry-based certifications:

- *Meet Texas Success Initiative (TSI) Criteria in ELA/Reading and Mathematics.*

- *Meet Criteria on Advanced Placement (AP)/International Baccalaureate (IB) Examination.*

- *Earn Dual Course Credits.*

- *Enlist in the Armed Forces.*

- *Earn an Industry-Based Certification.*

- *Earn an Associate's Degree.*

- *Graduate with Completed IEP and Workforce Readiness.*

- *CTE Coherent Sequence Coursework Aligned with Industry-Based Certifications.*

- *Complete an OnRamps Dual Enrollment Course.*

- *Graduate Under an Advanced Degree Plan and be Identified as a Current Special Education Student.*

- *Earn a Level I or Level II Certificate.*

Graduation Rate Component—Methodology

The graduation rate component of the Student Achievement domain includes the best of the four-year, five-year, or six-year high school graduation rates or the annual dropout rate, if no graduation rate is available. The annual dropout rate will be used on a safeguard basis only for campuses

designated as dropout recovery schools (DRS). For additional information, see Chapter 2 of the *2019 Accountability Manual*.

Student Achievement Domain Rating—Methodology
For elementary, middle, and high schools/K–12s without CCMR or graduation rate components, the STAAR component scaled score is the Student Achievement domain scaled score. For high schools, K–12s, and districts with CCMR and graduation rate components, the STAAR component scaled score is weighted at 40 percent, the CCMR component scaled score at 40 percent, and the graduation rate converted score at 20 percent to determine the Student Achievement domain scaled score.

For districts and campuses lacking a graduation rate component, the STAAR component scaled score is weighted at 50 percent and the CCMR component scaled score at 50 percent to determine the Student Achievement domain scaled score.

For districts and campuses lacking both the CCMR and the graduation rate components, the STAAR component scaled score is the Student Achievement domain scaled score.

For more information about scaling, please see "Chapter 5—Calculating 2019 Ratings" of the *2019 Accountability Manual* or visit our Scaling Resources page at www.tea.texas.gov/2019scalingresources.aspx .

School Progress Domain
School Progress measures district and campus outcomes in two areas: the number of students that grew at least one year academically (or are on track) as measured by STAAR results and the achievement of all students relative to districts or campuses with similar economically disadvantaged percentages.

School Progress, Part A: Academic Growth—Methodology
School Progress, Part A: Academic Growth provides an opportunity for districts and campuses to receive credit for STAAR results in ELA/reading and mathematics that either meet the student-level criteria for the STAAR progress measure or maintain performance. For additional details about how points are awarded, please see "Chapter 3—School Progress Domain" of the *2019 Accountability Manual*.

School Progress, Part B: Relative Performance—Methodology
School Progress, Part B: Relative Performance measures the achievement of all students on either STAAR across all subjects or STAAR across all subjects and the College, Career, and Military component (if available) relative to districts or campuses (by campus type) with similar economically disadvantaged percentages.

School Progress Domain Rating—Methodology
The better outcome of the School Progress, Part A or Part B scaled scores is used for the School Progress domain rating. If either Part A or Part B's scaled score results in a *F* rating, the highest scaled score that can be used is an 89. For more information about scaling, please see "Chapter 5—Calculating 2019 Ratings" of the *2019 Accountability Manual*.

Closing the Gaps Domain
Closing the Gaps uses disaggregated data in four components to demonstrate differentials among racial/ethnic groups, socioeconomic backgrounds and other factors. The indicators included in this domain, as well as the domain's construction, align the state accountability system with the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

The Closing the Gaps domain evaluates performance of fourteen student groups:
- All students

- Seven racial/ethnic groups: African American, American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, white, and two or more races
- Economically disadvantaged
- Students receiving special education services
- Students formerly receiving special education services
- Current and monitored English learners (through year 4 of monitoring)
- Continuously enrolled
- Non-continuously enrolled

Academic Achievement—Methodology

Each student group is evaluated by subject area on the percentage of ELA/reading and mathematics assessment results that are at the Meets Grade Level or above standard. Each student group's performance is then compared to the 2019 Academic Achievement performance targets. The performance targets are provided in "Chapter 4—Closing the Gaps Domain" of the *2019 Accountability Manual*.

Academic Growth Status—Methodology

For elementary and middle schools, as well as high schools, K–12s, and districts without graduation rates, each student group is evaluated by subject area on the percentage of ELA/reading and mathematics assessment results that maintained performance or met the growth expectations on STAAR. Each student group's performance is then compared to the 2019 Academic Growth Status performance targets. Please see "Chapter 3—School Progress Domain" for details on how points are awarded for growth. The performance targets are provided in "Chapter 4—Closing the Gaps Domain" of the *2019 Accountability Manual*.

Federal Graduation Status—Methodology

For high schools, K–12s, and districts with graduation rates the Federal Graduation Status component measures the federal four-year graduation rate for each student group in the Class of 2018. Texas uses the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) dropout definition and the federal calculation for graduation rate. For the Class of 2018, the four-year graduation target is 90 percent of students graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years. The performance targets are provided in "Chapter 4—Closing the Gaps Domain" of the *2019 Accountability Manual*.

English Language Proficiency Component—Methodology

The English Language Proficiency component evaluates the TELPAS results for grades K–12. For 2019, current year TELPAS results are compared to the prior year to determine if the students made progress. In order to be included in the denominator, a student must have either a current year Advanced High TELPAS composite rating or a non-zero 2018 TELPAS composite rating. TELPAS results prior to 2018 are not evaluated. TELPAS Alternate results are not evaluated in 2019.

Student Achievement Domain Score: STAAR Component Only—Methodology

For elementary and middle schools, as well as high schools, K–12s, and districts without annual graduates, the Student Achievement Domain Score: STAAR Component Only evaluates STAAR results in all subject areas at the Approaches Grade Level or above, Meets Grade Level or above, and Masters Grade Level standard. The performance rates calculated in this component are the disaggregated results used in the Student Achievement domain. The performance targets are provided in "Chapter 4—Closing the Gaps Domain" of the *2019 Accountability Manual*.

College, Career, and Military Readiness Performance Status—Methodology

For high schools, K–12s, and districts with annual graduates the College, Career, and Military Readiness Performance Status component measures students' preparedness for college, the

workforce, or the military. This component differs slightly from the CCMR component in the Student Achievement domain. The denominator used here is annual graduates plus students in grade 12 who did not graduate. The performance targets are provided in "Chapter 4—Closing the Gaps Domain" of the *2019 Accountability Manual*.

Closing the Gaps Domain Rating—Methodology
The percentage of eligible indicators met out of the total eligible indicators determines the component scores. Each component is weighted according to the following table and scaled. For more information about scaling, please see "Chapter 5—Calculating 2019 Ratings" of the *2019 Accountability Manual*.

Closing the Gaps Component Weights		
Campus Types	**Closing the Gaps Domain Component**	**Weight**
Elementary and Middle Schools	Academic Achievement	30%
	Academic Growth Status	50%
	English Language Proficiency	10%
	Student Achievement Domain Score: STAAR Component Only	10%
High Schools, K–12s, AEAs, and Districts	Academic Achievement	50%
	Federal Graduation Status or Academic Growth Status[2]	10%
	English Language Proficiency	10%
	College, Career, and Military Readiness or Student Achievement Domain Score: STAAR Component Only[3]	30%

Overall District or Campus Rating

The better outcome of the Student Achievement and the School Progress domain scaled scores is weighted at 70 percent. If either domain's scaled score results in an *F* rating, the highest scaled score that can be used is an 89.

The Closing the Gaps domain scaled score is weighted at 30 percent. The total weighted outcome of the two scaled scores is the overall score.

A district may not receive an overall or domain rating of *A* if the district includes any campus with an overall or corresponding domain rating of *D* or *F*. In this case, the highest scaled score a district can receive for the overall or in the corresponding domain is an 89.

If an *F* rating is received in three of the four areas of Student Achievement; School Progress, Part A: Academic Growth; School Progress, Part B: Relative Performance; or Closing the Gaps, the highest scaled score a district, open-enrollment charter school, or campus can receive for the overall rating is a 59. In order for this provision to be applied, the district, open-enrollment charter school, or campus must be evaluated in all four areas. If the Student Achievement domain rating is a *D* or higher, this provision will not be applied.

Part 4—Inclusion of English Learners in 2019 Accountability

English learners (ELs) who are year one in U.S. schools are excluded from accountability performance calculations. ELs who in year two in U.S. schools are included in performance components using the EL performance measure. For additional information, please refer to the EL performance measure resource available at https://tea.texas.gov/Student_Testing_and_Accountability/Accountability/State_Accountability/Performance_Reporting/Assessment_Scoring_and_Reporting/.

STAAR Alternate 2 assessment results will be included regardless of an EL's years in U.S. schools.

The STAAR progress measure is used for ELs and non-ELs in the School Progress, Part A domain.

Unschooled asylees, unschooled refugees, and students with interrupted formal education (SIFEs) are not included in state accountability until their sixth year of enrollment in U.S. schools.

Part 5—Other Accountability System Processes

Pairing

All campuses serving prekindergarten through grade 12 must receive an accountability rating. Campuses that do not serve any grade level for which STAAR assessments are administered are paired with another campus in the same district for accountability purposes. A campus may pair with its district and be evaluated on the district's results. For more information on campus pairing, please see "Chapter 7—Other Accountability System Processes" of the *2019 Accountability Manual*.

Alternative Education Accountability Provisions

Alternative education accountability (AEA) charter schools and campuses are evaluated on all the domains, components, and indicators except for School Progress, Part B: Relative Performance due to the small number of districts and campuses used for comparison.

Alternative procedures applicable to the graduation rate and annual dropout rate calculations are provided for approved campuses and charter schools serving at-risk students in alternative education programs. Please see "Chapter 2—Student Achievement Domain" of the *2019 Accountability Manual*.

Targets and cut points established by campus type have AEA-specific targets and cut points, as applicable. AEA charter schools and campuses also have the opportunity to earn bonus points which may be added to the overall scaled score. For more information, please see "Chapter 5—Calculating 2019 Ratings" of the *2019 Accountability Manual*.

Part 6—Distinction Designations

Districts and campuses that receive an accountability rating of *A, B, C,* or *D* are eligible to earn distinction designations. Distinction designations are awarded for achievement in several areas and are based on performance relative to a group of campuses of similar type, size, grade span, and student demographics.

For 2019, distinction designations are awarded in the following areas:

- Academic Achievement in English Language Arts/Reading (campus only)
- Academic Achievement in Mathematics (campus only)
- Academic Achievement in Science (campus only)
- Academic Achievement in Social Studies (campus only)
- Top 25 Percent: Comparative Academic Growth (campus only)
- Top 25 Percent: Comparative Closing the Gaps (campus only)
- Postsecondary Readiness (district and campus)

Please see "Chapter 6—Distinction Designations" of the *2019 Accountability Manual* for more information.

Part 7—Appeals

The commissioner of education is required to provide a process for school districts (districts) or open-enrollment charter schools (charter schools) to challenge an agency determination of its accountability rating (Texas Education Code [TEC] §39.151). A successful accountability appeal is usually limited to such rare cases as a data or calculation error attributable to the testing contractor(s), a regional education service center, or TEA. Online applications provided by TEA and the testing contractors ensure that districts and charter schools are aware of data correction opportunities, particularly through TSDS PEIMS data submissions and the Texas Assessment Management System (TAMS). District and charter school responsibility for data quality is the cornerstone of a fair and uniform rating determination. An appeal that is solely based on a district's submission of inaccurate data will likely be denied.

District and charter school appeals that challenge the agency determination of the accountability rating are carefully reviewed by an external panel. District superintendents and chief operating officers of charter schools may appeal accountability ratings by following the guidelines in "Chapter 8—Appealing the Ratings" of the *2019 Accountability Manual*.

Part 8—Identification of Schools for Improvement

To align identification of schools for improvement with the state's accountability system, TEA utilizes the Closing the Gaps domain performance to identify comprehensive, targeted, and additional targeted support and improvement schools. For further information, please see "Chapter 10—Identification of Schools for Improvement" of the *2019 Accountability Manual*.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement Identification

The Closing the Gaps domain scaled score is used to identify schools for comprehensive support and improvement. TEA rank orders the scaled domain score for all campuses. The lowest five percent of campuses that receive Title I, Part A funds are identified for comprehensive support and improvement.

Additionally, if any Title I or non-Title I campus does not attain a 67 percent four-year federal graduation rate for the all students group, the campus is identified for comprehensive support and improvement. Non-Title I campuses are not eligible for comprehensive support grant funding.

Any Title I campus identified for targeted support and improvement for three consecutive years for the same student group(s) is identified for comprehensive support and improvement the following school year.

Any campus identified for comprehensive support and improvement that has fewer than 100 students enrolled as reported in October snapshot is not required to implement interventions associated with the identification. If a campus chooses not to implement interventions, it is not eligible for comprehensive support grant funding. Choosing not to implement interventions does not exit the campus from comprehensive support and improvement identification.

Targeted Support and Improvement Identification

TEA uses the Closing the Gaps domain to identify campuses that have consistently underperforming student groups. A student group that misses the targets in at least the same **three** indicators, for three consecutive years, is considered "consistently underperforming." Any campus not identified for comprehensive support and improvement that has at least one consistently underperforming student group is identified for targeted support and improvement. Campuses are evaluated annually for identification.

Additional Targeted Support Identification

Any campus that is not identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement is identified for additional targeted support if an individual student group's percentage of evaluated indicators met is at or below the percentage used to identify **that campus type** for comprehensive support and improvement. Identification occurs on an annual basis.

For example, in 2018 the scaled Closing the Gaps cut point for comprehensive identification at the bottom five percent of Title I campuses was a scaled score of 47. Unscaling the 47 equated to a 13 elementary raw score and a 6 middle/high school raw score. Those raw scores were then set as the percentage of indicators a student group must meet (by campus type). Any elementary campus that had a student group that met fewer than 13 percent (middle/high school 6 percent) of evaluated indicators was identified for additional targeted support.

Exit Criteria for Comprehensive Support and Improvement

Campuses that do not rank in the bottom five percent of the Closing the Gaps domain for two consecutive years *and* have increased a letter grade (for example, from *F* to *D* or from *D* to *C*) on the Closing the Gaps domain are considered as having successfully exited comprehensive support and improvement status.

Campuses identified as comprehensive support and improvement based solely on a graduation rate below 67 percent must have a four-year federal graduation rate of at least 67 percent for two consecutive years to exit comprehensive support and improvement status.

Exit Criteria for Additional Targeted Support Schools

To exit additional targeted support status, the student group(s) that triggered the additional targeted support status must meet the targets for the Academic Achievement component in both reading and mathematics.

Part 9—Local Accountability Systems

House Bill 22 (85th Texas Legislature, Regular Session, 2017) established Local Accountability Systems (LAS), which allow districts and open-enrollment charter schools to develop plans to locally evaluate their campuses. Once a LAS plan receives approval from the agency, districts and open-enrollment charter schools may use locally developed domains and indicators with the three state-mandated domains to assign ratings for campuses that meet certain criteria. Please see "Chapter 11—Local Accountability Systems" of the *2019 Accountability Manual* for more information.

LAS Implementation

The implementation of LAS is optional. Districts and open-enrollment charter schools that choose to participate must follow the procedures for implementation as are adopted in the *2019 Local Accountability System Manual*.

The LAS process includes a planning and implementation year during which districts and open-enrollment charter schools may work with TEA LAS staff to design and refine a LAS plan. LAS domains, components, scaling methodologies, and metrics are established during the implementation year. Once the LAS plan is final, it is reviewed and approved or denied by TEA staff and an independent review panel consisting of representatives from current LAS districts.

Ratings Under LAS

Districts and open-enrollment charter schools produce campus ratings for each LAS domain and for LAS overall. These ratings consist of a scaled score and a corresponding letter grade. Upon completion of the planning year, participating districts submit LAS data to the agency, and TEA releases "what if" ratings for LAS campuses. The "what if" ratings are generated based on LAS data and state accountability data and provide districts and open-enrollment charter schools a preview of outcomes when LAS overall ratings are applied to state overall ratings for an overall campus rating.

At the end of the second year of LAS implementation, districts and open-enrollment charter schools submit actual LAS scaled scores and corresponding letter grades for the agency to apply to the state overall campus ratings. Districts and open-enrollment charter schools must submit scaled scores and letter grades assigned for each domain and overall for each LAS campus as approved in the LAS plan. LAS campuses that receive a *C* or higher state overall rating have their LAS overall scaled score applied to their state overall scaled score. The LAS plan specifies the proportion the LAS rating contributes to the overall campus rating, which may be up to 50 percent.

TEA calculates overall ratings for LAS campuses by applying the LAS overall scaled score at the proportion determined by the district to the state accountability overall scaled score. The overall scaled score and rating produced is then displayed on the txschools.gov and TEA websites along with the overall and domain scaled scores and ratings for both LAS and state accountability.

2019 LAS Ratings

For 2019, campuses that participated in the 2017–18 LAS pilot and received "what if" scaled scores must submit year two LAS data by July 1, 2019, in order to have LAS outcomes applied to 2019 state campus ratings. If these campuses receive a *C* or higher state overall rating, overall scaled scores and ratings are published in TEAL Accountability and on the public websites on August 15, 2019, reflecting the application of LAS ratings to state ratings. For additional information on LAS submission requirements, please see Chapter 2 of the *2019 Local Accountability System Manual*.